DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 241 AC 010 034

AUTHOR	Sultan, Paul; Ehmann, Gerhard E.
TITLE	The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender.
INSTITUTION	National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	44p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adjustment (to Environment), Bias, *Correctional Education, Corrective Institutions, Criminals, Employer Attitudes, *Employment Practices, Job Training, *Personnel Policy, *Prisoners

ABSTRACT

This document was an attempt to distill in a readable form some of the highlights of seminars and institutes sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Los Angeles for the purpose of studying the effect of social labelling of persons with an arrest record on their chances of being employed and earning an honest living. Some of the issues discussed are: society's trampling of the offender; Americans' fear of crime; what the prison does to and for the offender; the possibilities for training and job orientation programs; psychological behavior in the adjustment process; innovative institutional programs; irrelevance of personnel tests and entry level requirements; orientation guidelines for the evaluation of police records; and inservice training in job survival. (PT)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender

ED047241

By
Paul Sultan
and
Gerhard E. Ehmann

AA001034

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

This publication has been made possible through the financial assistance of The Garrett Corporation, Joint Council of Teamsters No. 42, and Thrifty Drug Stores Co., Inc.

ED0 47241

The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender

By
Paul Sultan
and
Gerhard E. Ehmann

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	3
Introduction	5
Society Tramples the Ex-Offender	8
Americans Are Fearful About Crime	9
What Do Prisons Do	11
The Possibilities for Training and Job Orientation Programs	16
Psychological Barriers in the Adjustment Process	18
Innovative Institutional Programs	20
Let's Stop Trampling the Ex-Offender	23
Personnel Tests and Entry-Level Requirements Are Often Irrelevant	26
Extending Probationary Periods with Sympathetic Job Orientation	28
Guidelines for the Evaluation of Police Records	29
Ex-Offenders Have Difficulty Getting Bonded	30
In-Service Training in Job Survival	33
Some Concluding Observations	34
References	38

FOREWORD

Following the disastrous Watts riot of August 1965 in Los Angeles, The National Conference of Christians and Jews in this area along with numerous other agencies and organizations was catapulted into a state of shock.

In the deep soul-searching that followed that catastrophe, the Labor, Management and Public Interest Committee of The National Conference of Christians and Jews (Southern California Region) made an important decision. The committee agreed that since unemployment was one of the root causes of the Watts explosion top priority should be given by the committee to this problem.

Surveys showed that one out of every two persons interviewed who were seeking employment in the Watts area following the riot had an arrest record. It was obvious to the committee that the employment of the ex-offender would be a major problem in the years immediately ahead.

Late in the fall of 1966, the committee sponsored its first seminar on the employment of the ex-offender. This was the beginning of a series of seminars and institutes sponsored by The National Conference of Christians and Jews in Los Angeles over a 3-year period. Nationally recognized leaders in the fields of management, labor, corrections, and employment participated in these institutes.

This booklet is an attempt to distill in a readable form some of the highlights of these institutes and seminars. The hope is that this material can be a useful tool in the hands of employers and others who are looking for some answers to this complicated and frustrating problem.

Paul Sultan was chairman of the Labor, Management and Public Interest Committee from 1966 to 1969. He is chairman of the Department of Economics at Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California. Gerhard E. Ehmann is the immediate past chairman of the committee. He is dean of Educational Services of California State College at Fullerton, California.

Special credit should be given to Robert M. Jones, executive director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews (Southern California Region) and to Robert C. Walker, program director of the region, for the development of these seminars and the coordination required to bring the results of these seminars into publication form.

LEONARD P. ARIES
Vice President and Director
Equal Opportunity in Industry Program

INTRODUCTION

When the National Conference of Christians and Jews was founded more than forty years ago, the solution of intergroup problems seemed simple. The basic cause was essentially the same then that it is now; the unwillingness of people to deal fairly with members of other religious, racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, eradicating prejudice should suffice, it would seem, to remove the handicaps that oppress its victims. For several decades the emphasis of National Conference programs was on the elimination of prejudice. In the past two decades NCCJ has broadened its scope to attack discriminatory practices.

Educating against prejudice and making bigotry unpopular are still the core of NCCJ's program. We shall not desist from combatting prejudice nor from attacking its progeny, discriminatory acts whose devastating effects are more discernible now than they were when the National Conference was founded. Today there is virtually no market for the unskilled labor of the deprived minorities. The victims of prejudiced treatment are no longer in rural areas and in relatively small urban slums. The problems created by prejudice have become more glaring and more destructive. Greater education and more intricate knowledge are urgently needed to rescue the disadvantaged. NCCJ's approach cannot be limited to studies of prejudice, to appeals to reason and to the cultivation of beneficent emotions. The cruel effects of historic and present prejudiced practices must be accurately diagnosed and not merely observed. The roots cannot be sprayed. They must be dug out.

A rarely discerned example of the ramifying effects of prejudice is what has been happening to those who have run afoul of the law and served a prison term, or have been arrested without adequate cause for the arrest. Some are apparently beyond redemption and will remain dangerous to others. But the overwhelming majority pays a frightful price, as does the whole of society, because although these

unfortunates are eager for rehabilitation, they are categorized with the worst element and suffer the outrageous treatment described in this booklet. Here we find the perennial trick of prejudice at work. The good are condemned without reference to their own characteristics. Their merits are disregarded. Having been convicted or merely arrested, they are deprived of the opportunity to earn an honest livelihood. Being bracketed in public opinion with hardened criminals, petty offenders are doomed and forced into crime.

I shall not attempt to draw even a few lines of the tragic pictures that emerge in this account, which describes the situation and offers realistic remedies for the appalling handicaps inflicted on many of our fellow citizens. This would be a proper subject for NCCJ, if only because helpless people are paying by their wrecked lives the price of prejudice—in this instance caused by treating all who have offended as though all were hardened criminals. If this devastating process will ever end or even lessen, it will be through regarding each who suffers unjustly as an individual instead of as an alleged member of an alleged criminal class. The problem falls within the concern of NCCJ likewise because for those already under the lash of racial prejudice, the admission "Yes, I have been arrested," or "Yes, I served in jail," brings doubled jeopardy and quadrupled penalty.

One of the features of this brochure that I find highly valuable is that, while it describes grim realities such as that "The United States prison system is a failure," and while the authors present the evidence to prove such assertions, they do not follow the example of some modern commentators who seem to believe that when they have reported a bad situation and deplored it thoroughly, and have said in effect that "they should do something about it," (the *they* being no one in particular), a milestone has been reached on the road to progress. In this study the reader will find a clear analysis of the problem and also specific remedial measures and certain mechanisms for reducing its dimensions. The suggestions are not based on

speculation or theorizing but on concrete examples of actual accomplishments which must be enormously magnified throughout our nation. To this program, which is closely related to our Equal Opportunity in Industry Program, the National Conference heartily subscribes.

In welcoming this innovative addition to NCCJ's literature on how to solve problems caused by prejudice, I wish to thank the authors, Paul Sultan and Gerhard E. Ehmann. Likewise appreciated is the contribution of NCCJ vice-president, Dr. Leonard P. Aries, and the patient, persistent work of two of NCCJ's West Coast staff. Digging at the economic and social roots of the Watts riots, Robert M. Jones and Robert C. Walker uncovered and explored some specific causes of that disastrous situation. The remedies for which they and others searched in a series of seminars and institutes are here presented.

There is urgent need for this booklet. Interest in having the manuscript published was expressed by the California Department of Corrections, The Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Los Angeles, Thrifty Drug Stores, The Teamsters Union, the Garrett Corporation, Lockheed Aircraft and McDonnell Douglas. The diversity of their interests suggests the great variety of organizations that may, if motivated and counseled, offer employment to persons with arrest records and ex-offenders. Unless this is done, innumerable members of minority groups will remain impoverished and embittered.

STERLING W. BROWN
President
National Conference of Christians and Jews

The Employment of Persons with Arrest Records and the Ex-Offender

SOCIETY TRAMPLES THE EX-OFFENDER

"I am an ex-con", George said to us, "and I want the emphasis on the 'ex'. But nobody will give me a chance to prove it. Sure, I committed a crime; I made a big mistake. I admit it, and I paid for it. I was caught and sent up for four years. Now I'm free. Society says I've squared things, and I can have another try at my own life, but nobody will let me get started. Why won't they give me a job? Why can't they let me alone? Why is everybody afraid of me? Didn't they ever make any mistakes themselves? What am I going to do?"

The answers to George's agonized questions are not easy to find, and the search for them leads deep into the roots of American social reaction. His questions need to be answered; the conscience of a civilized society based on the Judeo-Christian ethic demands that you and I face our fears and actions toward ex-law violators, making our fears more rational and our actions more constructive. Faced with evasive indifference if not open hostility, many ex-offenders struggle against great odds in their attempts to

rejoin the society in which the vast majority yearn to be worthy members. Have we freed them from imprisonment in order to shut them out of a free society? Where else is there for them to go?

We are beginning to learn a few things about how to help ex-offenders to keep from repeating their mistakes. We are also beginning to learn how harmful our expressed feelings of fear toward them can be.

AMERICANS ARE FEARFUL ABOUT CRIME

Americans are afraid that law and order have broken down and that crime is running rampant. A study of 1700 persons revealed that 91% of the sample admitted they had committed acts for which they could conceivably be sent to jail. Although the great majority of these acts are regarded as petty offenses and not really crimes in the serious sense, the persons involved felt they had made breaches of the law demanding punishment; their attitude toward their own behavior therefore contributes to their and others' recent greatly increased fear of crime. Forty-three percent of respondents in two large cities said they stayed off the streets at night because of their fear of crime. One-third of a representative sample of *all* Americans say it is unsafe to walk alone at night in their neighborhoods. Although these citizens' fears are only hearsay, and in many cases may not be justified, they are nevertheless indicative of the state which people's minds have reached regarding the occurrence of law-breaking, and the consequent threat to their sense of well-being.

Crime *has* increased, of course, but it would be naive to compare year to year changes of crimes without comparing those increases to changes in population size, and indeed, changes in the age composition of the population. For example, the greatest incidence of more serious crimes occurs in the 20 to 24 age group; in the decade of the sixties, this age group has increased by 55%, more of an

increase than any other age group. So even if the crime rate for this age group remained unchanged, crime would have risen 55%. As the number of people in the 20-24 age group decreases in relation to the whole population in the years ahead, as we know it will, the threat of crime from that age group decreases. Although crime is on the increase, a careful look at the statistics gives no evidence that law and order are falling apart.

On the contrary, the agencies of law and order have never been well coordinated either in goals or in methods. As the President's Crime Commission puts it:

> "It is commonly assumed that these three components—law enforcement (police, sheriffs, marshalls), the judicial process (judges, prosecutors, defense lawyers) and corrections (prison officials, probation and parole officers)—add up to a 'system' of criminal justice.
> "A system implies some unity of purpose and organized interrelationship among component parts. In the typical American city and state, and under Federal jurisdiction as well, no such relationship exists." (1)

The Commission goes on to explain that law enforcement today, as traditionally, is not a rational, orderly system, but a disjointed collection of governmental units that have often worked one against the other. There is, to be sure, a reasonably well-defined criminal process, a continuum through which each accused offender may pass; from the hands of the police, to the jurisdiction of the courts, behind the walls of a prison, then back on the street. But the inefficiency, fall-out and failure of purpose during this process is notorious.

The increasing anxiety about crime may give an upward bias to crime statistics. First, it may well be that growing consciousness about crime has increased public reporting of criminal activity. If, as evidence indicates, only about half of all crimes are officially reported, public concern about crime should encourage its reporting. The growth rate may reflect such increased sensitivity, rather than an increase of criminal activity.

Second, it is clear that the completeness of reporting varies considerably from state to state. With the increase in professional law enforcement, it is likely that increased or improved accuracy in the reporting process can account for some of the upward drift in recorded criminal activity.

Third, the dramatic increase in the absolute levels of criminal activity may well be accounted for by the increase of the crime-prone age groups of the population.

Fourth, definitions of delinquency have been refined. In previous generations, police activities that have involved nonarrest, remedial activities and warnings may not have been counted as formal enforcement activities, but under present-day standards, may well be listed as law-enforcement activity.

And finally, some students of violence in the United States have drawn from historical example to illustrate the violence and unrest characteristic of certain phases of our industrial history. If reference to the violence of our own industrial past proves discomforting, other students have established data to indicate that, by international comparisons, American violence and crime is not a "leading" characteristic of American life:

> The homicide rate in the United States today is steadily around 4 or 5 per 100,000 with only slight variations from year to year. In 1933, it was over twice as high, or around 11. The murder rate for Columbia is 34; for Mexico, 30; Nicaragua, 29; Guatemala, 12; Ecuador, 6—even with poorly collected statistics. (2)

WHAT DO PRISONS DO?

The Chief of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Myrl E. Alexander, has bluntly asserted that the United States prison system is a failure. The brutal reality, Alexander charges, is that of the 200,000 persons in prison in America on any given day, ninety-six percent will eventually be released, *of which two-thirds will be rejailed for new*

offenses. Elaborating on the neglected reality of prison failure, Alexander explains:

> Simply removing an offender to an institution as punishment often only compounds the problem of reintegrating him into the community as a law-abiding citizen. All too frequently it costs him his job, severs his family ties, and pins on him a label that makes all of his problems more difficult to overcome.
> So as a means of punishment and as an instrument with which to change criminal behavior, imprisonment is a failure.
> It must be acknowledged that even among the best correctional institutions at least thirty percent of the inmates become repeaters.

The penalties suffered by society for its inefficient "re-absorption" of the ex-offender can hardly be exaggerated. In a 1966 study made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of 6,900 former inmates released in 1963, it was found that 48 percent of those released had been arrested for new crimes in their first two years of freedom. Even more depressing was the more recent FBI study of re-releases from the District of Columbia's Lorton Youth Center. These individuals experienced, over a longer period of time, a recividist rate of 78 percent. Why is this so? (3)

In 1931, John L. Gillin described the character of penal institutions, probably as relevant today as it was then:

> What monuments of stupidity are these institutions we have built—stupidity not so much of the inmates as of free citizens. What a mockery of science is our prison discipline, our massing together in one stupendous potpourri. How silly of us to think we can prepare man for social life by reversing the ordinary process of socialization—silence for the only animal with speech; repressive regimentation of men who are in prison because they need to learn how to exercise their activities in constructive ways; outward conformity to rules which repress all efforts at constructive expression; work without the operation of economic motives; motivation by fear of punishment rather than by hope of reward or appeal to their higher motives . . . (4)

Nor is there any lack of contemporary criticism of our correctional institutions. Harry A. Wilmer, for example, charges:

> While furiously stamping out crime, we are spreading it in antiquated prisons with ineffectual rehabilitation programs inadequately financed, with staffs inadequately trained. Our present system of imprisonment, on the whole, is probably useless rehabilitation. (5)

The President's Crime Commission observed "America's system of criminal justice is overcrowded and overworked, undermanned, underfinanced, and very often misunderstood. (6) Because of manpower deficiencies, most institutions are almost entirely custodial in a physical sense, with high walls, locked gates and barred windows. Congestion compounds the "human warehousing" aspect of the penal system. As Prison Director, Myrl E. Alexander charges, prisons simply fail to offer their inhabitants an alternative way of life by training them for noncriminal careers. Prison schooling has a low priority and most prison instruction is conducted by inmate-instructors. And training prisoners to make license plates or mail sacks hardly equips them for work outside. (7)

In brief, the human warehouses are dominated by one characteristic—idleness.

Even though in the course of a year correctional institutions handle nearly 2.5 million admissions, and spend over a billion dollars doing so, correctional mechanisms as they now exist do not "correct." Life in many institutions is described as "at best barren and futile, at worst unspeakably brutal and degrading." (8) The institutions provide, in essence, the poorest possible preparation for the successful re-entry of ex-offenders into society. The Crime Commission noted the special inmate culture which "may" develop, with deleterious consequences for everyone, and especially juvenile offenders. "Certain inmates—often the most aggressive—assume control over the others with tacit staff consent . . . Rackets, violence, corruption, coerced

homosexuality, and other abuses may exist without staff intervention." (9)

Or, as Norval Morris makes the point, we have mega-institutions grossly too large, characterized by the mass anonymity which encourages the hot-house growth of the evil subculture within the prison. (10)

The statistics on training support these contentions: Less than 3 percent of all personnel working in local jails and institutions devote their time to the treatment and training of the prisoners. Eleven states do not offer any kind of probation services for adult misdemeanants; six offer only the barest fragments of such services and most states offer them on a spotty basis. Two-thirds of all state adult felony probationers are in caseloads of over 100 persons, although only 30 persons is considered by the profession to be a maximum caseload for a supervisor. (11)

Furthermore, only a small fraction of 1 percent of the criminal justice system's total budget is spent on research, in sharp contrast to the 3 percent industry spends on research, and the 15 percent spent by the Defense Department. (12) Charles S. Prigmore, former executive director of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, estimates that . . . "possibly fewer than 5 percent of the people now in prisons and reformatories are receiving training for jobs they can continue when they get out . . ." Even the best correctional systems, such as carried on by the Federal Bureau of Prisons and in such states as California, Michigan and Wisconsin are giving only 20 percent of their inmates usable job training.

There is, then, the obvious need to redesign our penal programs, but can we expect major innovations to be made by the correctional institutions themselves? Sanger Powers is not optimistic as he describes the "comfortable" adjustment of penologists to traditional ways:

> We, along with the prisoners, all too often become institutionalized, accustomed to a given way of doing things, threatened by change, preferring routine thinking, satis-

> fied to do today as we did yesterday, to do tomorrow what we did today. We have been able in a rapidly changing world to keep alive at least some remnants of the good old days, some nostalgic correctional Shangri-las behind stone walls where we have been successful in slowing the march of time and progress. (13)

During an era when educational achievement serves as a convenient generalization by employers in predicting occupational success for job applicants, we witness a serious—and growing—imbalance between the educational status of the inmate population and the civilian population. Well over half of the prison population has only an elementary school education, or less. On the upper level of education 18% of the general population has college experience, compared with only 5.3% of the prison population.

Even more discouraging, the educational level of the total population has increased over the years much more rapidly than that of the prison population. In viewing his depressing statistics on job prospects for the released offender, Robert Evans concludes:

> What is really required is a radical reconstruction of the prison system. The typical offender must be seen as one who has 1) deficient education, 2) poor work habits, 3) no real job skills, and 4) the stigma of prison. In short, he needs, like the ugly duckling, to be made over. (14)

To these considerations, one must add the absence of skills, as reflected by the occupations (before incarceration) of the prison population. The preponderance of pre-prison jobs held were in the service-worker, household worker, and laborer class, with only 4% in the manager and owner group and 2% among professional and technical workers.

Portraits of offenders reveal the syndrome of forces that challenge the rehabilitation process. Offenders are likely to be members of the lowest social and economic groups in the country; they are usually poorly educated. They are often unemployed, unmarried, reared in broken homes, and have a record of arrests. These represent a formidable combination of traits to employers of labor. And when the

reality of race is cranked into the profile, the incidence of difficulty is further compounded.

THE POSSIBILITIES FOR TRAINING AND JOB ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

The prospect of rehabilitation is not encouraging when those who have served terms are simply "reinserted" into a competitive society. Reviewing the results of pilot studies of extended prison training, Dr. Curtis Aller, former Associate Manpower Administrator, Dept. of Labor, Washington, D.C. noted that 1) prisoners are educable and trainable; 2) prisoners require realistic training and "tailored" job development and placement support if the training is to be "genuinely rehabilitative," and 3) employers will, with proper orientation, hire and rehire ex-offenders. The gate to employment may often be closed. But it is not locked.

Government pilot projects have revealed dramatic possibilities for rehabilitative training program results. It has been found, for example, that prisoners starting with a 7th and 8th grade education can often accomplish a high school equivalency certificate in only one year. (15)

Further, even limited training experiences, if linked to job placement and follow-up counseling, can be remarkably successful. In the study of 200 inmates involved in training programs, at the Draper Correctional Institution (Elmore, Alabama) it was found, after a year of lapsed time, that 89 percent of the trainees acknowledged their pre-release training programs helped them in getting jobs. Turnover in employment during the first year was high: 78 percent. But two-thirds of the job changes were to improve earnings and ninety-three percent of the group were rated as "satisfactory" employees in their first jobs. The unusual measure of job mobility in their first year did not prevent their becoming stable employees.

An additional study has been made of training program success in Lorton, Virginia, where many of the trainees

would be regarded as incorrigible. Sixty-seven percent had a record of previous incarcerations; eighty-seven percent had more than three arrests. But even for this group, the recidivist rate was cut 26 percent.

Another encouraging experiment is provided by the trades apprenticeship program at the McNeil Island Federal Penitentiary, a maximum security prison 4 miles offshore in the waters of Puget Sound in the State of Washington. To date, this program has proved remarkably successful. Even the more hardened long-term inmates have witnessed the program's payoff for released "graduates", and have passed the word to the younger inmates via the prison "grapevine." Enrollment in the program is timed so that the completion of the apprenticeship will coincide as closely as possible with the prisoner's release date. The program is administered by the Multi-Trades Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee, assisted by 24 representatives of labor and management for each of the 12 trade classifications. The committees make certain that training has "practical value" for the inmate.

The successes of active comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs are encouraging. For example, the California Institute for Men at Chino has developed a well-coordinated program to secure jobs for released employees. It found that the recidivist rate for its graduates was 39% compared to a rate nationally of 57% for similar groups. For inmates who had experienced its vocational rehabilitation program, the recidivist rate was further reduced to 19%. (16)

It is clear that in the development of training programs for inmates, there is a need to mesh the cycle of training with the sentence term of the students, so that individuals who complete the program are not left in a "holding" operation. Secondly, "institutional needs" should not bias the direction of those training programs. We must create opportunities for sophisticated skill development. We must avoid training for dead-end jobs, and training activities that are not challenging to the inmate.

PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIERS IN THE ADJUSTMENT PROCESS

But most important, there are imposing psychological barriers for released convicts, such as frequently uncontrolled suspicions of personal inadequacy, and suspicion about the integrity or sincerity of people who try to help them. Some men do not honor scheduled interviews with prospective employers simply because they feel inadequate to handle the interview situation.

Unless these anxieties are understood, such "bad experience" with ex-offenders simply reinforces the stereotype of "the ex-offender" as an incorrigible villain or a thoroughly beaten man.

It must be appreciated, however, that for those who have been convicted, and served "time", a cultural, psychological, and sociological "gap" develops. Even for the few who have the advantage of training programs while institutionalized, there is a distinct shock effect in adjustments to the competitive realities of the "real" world.

To those unfamiliar with prison experience, it may seem incongruous to suggest that "freedom" from the non-free world to the free one is not an easy experience. It is during the critical period of the first ninety days that the ex-offender has to dispel self-doubts, and suspicions, that his delicate fabric of self-assurance, and faith in the decency and humanity of society, must be restored. One hundred dollars of "gate" money will not do the job. His understanding and encouragement of the community, will.

There is no lack of testimony on the critical nature of this psychological barrier in the adjustment process. Sanger B. Powers explains, "Most offenders have an incredibly poor self-concept and have learned to accept or live with a devalued self-image, with a resultant inability to cope with their environment." (17)

Mary E. Switzer, as commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation of H.E.W., characterizes the "typical offender" as one who tends to be impulsive, lacks stability and consis-

tency in his behavior, and finds it extremely difficult to postpone immediate satisfactions in order to attain future rewards" . . . She also acknowledges that, "in some cases, he is a master manipulator who has honed this talent during many years of simple survival in the urban jungle." (18)

It is generally agreed that institutional experience complicates the adjustment process. The isolation and regimentation of the institutional community creates an artificial environment in which self-reliance and self-control may errode or collapse. Facing release, social apprehensions mount: An individual may doubt his ability to secure a job, or to hold one. As J. E. Baker points out, we must come face to face with a characteristic common to prison inmates: a low frustration tolerance with the corollary of limited perseverance in the face of almost any obstacle. Further support for this contention was found when letter contacts to potential employers made by the Employment Placement Service encouraged 50 percent of the released prisoners to make the initial contact. But when a job was not immediately available, few reported back for a further interview. (19)

It must be admitted, however, that frequently trainees develop unrealistic expectations of their earnings potential with the completion of a training course, or are perplexed about the need to accept low wage positions. Having generated the hope of a "better life" they may be impatient with the modest incomes or low-skill job assignments. These problems again emphasize the need for reality therapy, or programs that acknowledge reality without crushing hope. (20)

Education is necessary on both sides. Lemar T. Empey, in his *Alternatives to Incarceration* has noted the critical role of mutual understanding in this adjustment process:

> A successful program must act as a community change-agent and mechanisms must be built by which to accomplish this. It would be a tragic mistake to set up programs whose sole mission was that of providing therapy to the inmate. He constitutes only half the problem; the other

> is structural and related to existing arrangements, economic, social or otherwise, which makes it difficult for the offender to be reintegrated into the community. (21)

Daniel R. Lopez, former manager of the largest of California's Service Centers in East Los Angeles, who is past deputy director of Job Training Development and Placement Division in the Department of Resources Development for the State of California and who is presently a California Adult Authority member, made the point eloquently: "Unemployed ex-offenders may well become permanent members of a demoralized subculture. They are isolated and a prey to their own suspicions. They trust nobody and nothing, not even themselves. They believe nothing, except the worst of everybody and everything. They see only confusion in themselves and conspiracies in other men. We witness the panic, and the disintegration of men stigmatized and rejected by the community." As Lopez emphasizes, this cycle can be broken only through person-to-person contact, follow-up and attentiveness to the individual. "We must view each person as an individual, not only with unique problems, but also a person with unique ways of making a positive contribution to our society."

INNOVATIVE INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS

One of the more innovative programs in prisoner rehabilitation is the Seventh Step Foundation. This organization has been conceived and is operated entirely by ex-offenders on the assumption that the invisible barrier between the "con" and the outside world can be penetrated, not by professional social workers, prison officials, ministers or psychiatrists but only by the ex-con himself. No matter how well-intentioned these professionals, they are stereotyped by the inmate culture as "square Johns." As the Seventh Step Foundation explains:

> The "cons" know that the "Square Johns" are honest, sincere, well-intentioned, etc., but it is hard for them to

believe it. After so many years of "fighting" them, they find it difficult to "join" them.
Just as a drunk will listen to someone else who has faced the same problem, just as an athlete will listen to his coach rather than to someone who has never competed in sports, just as an expectant mother will listen to her own mother rather than her maiden aunt, so will the convict pay more attention to someone who has been in prison himself.

The Foundation program conducts group counseling sessions to get inmates into touch with reality. Weekly meetings are held within prisons for inmates who request such participation and who are within 120 days of their release date. The sessions, designed to identify inmate hostilities and anxieties are discussions in which "anything goes . . ." All problems are identified and examined. Distinctions are made between warranted and unwarranted hostilities in a thorough search for the sources of resentment and their validity, but most important group discussions focus on the reality of the outside world and the adjustments necessary to live productively in it. The organization embraces the slogan, "Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

The Foundation continues to act as a friend and counselor to inmates following their release. It continues weekly meetings to discuss adjustment problems, to exchange information on job opportunities, to assist each other in securing transportation to jobs, and so on. They exchange information on their adjustment experiences to accelerate their return to productive and respected membership in society. Such Foundation activity has provided a spectacular decrease in recidivism. Penal authorities such as Clinton Duffy have warmly endorsed the program. The traditional rule that a man on parole cannot associate with others who have a criminal record has been amended to accord formal endorsement and respect for the invaluable services rendered by this self-help organization. Like other organizations intent on assisting disadvantaged individuals, its most precious asset is the confidence that employers

have placed in members they have hired. Its critically scarce resource is the limited number of job opportunities for the flow of members hoping with a firm grip on reality to secure employment. (22)

A second innovation which inevitably must be expanded is the "work release" program. This enables sentenced offenders to be employed on regular jobs in nearby communities while returning to jail during nonworking hours. The rewards of this arrangement are impressive. It provides an opportunity for employment in a "normal" setting at "normal" wages. It permits some offenders to keep their families intact, to pay their debts. It provides inmates with a cash reserve to facilitate their return to private life. It assists individuals in their acclimation to noninstitutional life. It is proving to be a highly effective correctional tool. While such programs were first acknowledged in principle at least by a 1913 Wisconsin statute, they have been implemented only recently; by the end of 1965 some 19 states had adopted some form of a work-release program. A negligible proportion of inmates (in one study less than 3 percent) have "gone over the hill" while participating in such programs. Its extension provides an ideal mechanism for easing motivated offenders into the realities of the "other" world.

A third program involves offering furloughs of limited duration—say from 10 days to 30 days—under arrangements that specify the place of the visit. Such visits can reinforce family ties, allow attendance at the funeral of a relative, visit a prospective employer or for other purposes that prepare offenders for "normal" community life. Over the years only about one percent of these privileged inmates have failed to return after the furlough expired.

A fourth innovation involves the release of selected inmates for participation in education and training programs outside of the institution. Inmates may be admitted to trade schools, junior colleges or universities while on a "work release" status. Such programs again afford inmates exposure to the pressure of the "outside" world, but provide

also a rich range of educational and training opportunities seldom afforded by prison institutions.

A fifth program involves the development of halfway houses. While the halfway house is not new, only recently have correctional administrators become increasingly aware of the need for such halfway steps between incarceration and complete release to the community as described in the preceding pages.

Needless to say, the savings provided by these programs are enormous. Instead of the liability of future crime and incarceration, productive service is added to the national product.

LET'S STOP TRAMPLING THE EX-OFFENDER

People—and more specifically employers—do not usually distinguish between an "arrest" record and convictions. In reality, arrest records have become critical determinants in the ordering of the "attractiveness" of job applicants by personnel offices.

For example, the President's Crime Commission found that "About 75 percent of employment agencies sampled in a recent study of employment practices in the New York City area state that they ask applicants about arrest records, and, *as a matter of regular procedure,* do not refer any applicant with a record, regardless of whether the arrest was followed by conviction." (23)

With remarkable restraint, the Commission observed, *"The fact that the majority of slum males (estimates vary from 50 to 90 percent) have some sort of arrest record indicates the magnitude of this problem."* (24)

The Commission exhorted employers to "better regulate" the use of arrest information, particularly when there is no serious follow-up of circumstances surrounding the arrest. "This is particularly important with respect to juvenile records, which may reflect adolescent habits abandoned by the time employment is being sought." Truman Jacques, working for the California State Department of

Employment as job placement officer in Watts estimated that in an interval of one year he had recorded interviews with approximately 8,000 persons seeking employment in the Watts area. Of that total, "One out of every two admitted to having had an arrest record." Jacques quickly added this did not imply that the entire Watts area was made up of persons with police records . . . but increasing numbers of male citizens seeking work were "marked" with that problem. Obviously then, if employers are unwilling to take a chance in hiring minority groups who *more often than not* may have arrest records, the "hard-core" character of unemployment becomes even more rigid.

Unfortunately, even when "official" company policy does not make such exclusion automatic, personnel officers with the responsibility of screening applicants may not appreciate the subtleties of that distinction. The "safe" response is simply to disregard the potentiality of any person with a record of arrest, or evidence of garnishments, trouble on the previous job, and so on. This issue is particularly aggravated because in many large organizations—be they private or public—the routine recruitment of new employees does not usually provide for the "case by case" care that would allow measured evaluation of job candidates. Thus, even though many leaders of our larger corporations have publicly affirmed a program of cooperation to ease the risk of arbitrary discrimination, there is considerable risk that the enlightened attitudes of corporate officers are not translated into the day-to-day actions of personnel officers charged with recruitment and the job evaluation process. Understanding and support are required at all levels.

The impact of screening processes involving automatic exclusion is attested to in the *President's Manpower Report.* A study was made of the barriers to employment in seven slum areas. Not surprisingly, a "bad record" proved to be a major obstacle to getting a job for at least ten percent of the unemployed. Similarly, male applicants for Federal Civil Service employment found difficulty in overcoming the

"bad record" stigma in their search for government employment. One study showed that ten percent of the applicants felt their police record had prevented serious consideration of their applications. As noted at the outset, in our complex society—and particularly with the unrest in the central city—the possibilities of arrest for youth have increased precipitously. Ironically, preventive police action may be compounding the task of job placement for the ghetto resident. And the problem will not be solved so long as employers do not distinguish between arrest and conviction or even between petty and more serious crimes.

It is frequently the practice of the police to "bring in" individuals for questioning as a preventive or checking measure. Clearly arrests made for questioning should not be prejudicial to an individual's job success. Nor should arrests followed by acquittal warrant employer suspicions that the arrested individual is a high-risk job candidate. Arrests and convictions must be distinguished. An arrest is not a crime. In its study of reemployment problems for the disadvantaged initiated in May 1968, the Los Angeles County Delinquency and Crime Commission proposes the modification of requests for information about both arrests and convictions. Arrest and conviction should not serve as a bar to employment without consideration for the job vacancy to be filled. Employers and employing agencies should require only such information on specified criminal offenses as may reasonably relate to the job under consideration. No jurisdiction or organization should demand information on convictions which have been formally expunged under appropriate court procedures. The Commission commends those agencies or firms which have eliminated all questions relating to arrests not followed by conviction and urges the further extension of this policy.

This recommendation is not built on the innocent or naive assumption that employers of the disadvantaged in either the private or public sector can abandon all consideration of efficiency on the altar of humanitarianism. But even in situations where conviction information is elicited,

it should be reviewed carefully to avoid the automatic rejection of a candidate. A determination should be made about the age of an applicant at the time of the offense, the nature of the offense, the relevance of the offense to possible impairment of effectiveness on the job in mind, the variability of policy practices within larger metropolitan areas and throughout the country, and most important, the *over-all* characteristics of the applicant.

PERSONNEL TESTS AND ENTRY-LEVEL REQUIREMENTS ARE OFTEN IRRELEVANT

What other policies will help reduce the multiple barriers to career opportunities for individuals with poor education, limited skills, inadequate, unsatisfactory, or nonexistent work experience? In order to secure work, these persons must expose themselves to performance tests or interviews that are bewildering and threatening. And they must confess to police records. Obviously, we must liberalize hiring practices through the abandonment (or serious modification) of traditional "entry level" requisites for a job. The Los Angeles County Delinquency and Crime Commission urges:

> Particularly in the human services sector, which is expanding rapidly as the result of technical and economic change, there is clear evidence that supposedly uneducated and unskilled persons, or even those with criminal records, can perform many varieties of work with an efficiency and effectiveness equal or superior to that attained by experienced professionals.

In overcoming traditional—and often unrealistic—entry level standards, a determined and conscious effort must be made by employers in both the private sector and in government to make a thorough review of existing job prerequisites. Unless there is conclusive evidence to the contrary, standard personnel tests and application forms that require elucidation of any "brush with the law" should be modified. As emphasized above, if employers view a blem-

ish on the employment record, or even the absence of an employment record as a predicator of job failure, the disadvantaged applicant has little chance to escape the poverty cycle.

A further device to expand employment opportunities for ex-offenders is the specifying of percentage of openings for which persons with a troubled history would be considered. In this way, it is possible to reorder the traditional queuing of job applicants. The one-time loser does not become a lifelong loser.

Other agencies and institutions have acknowledged the need for special programs to remedy a history of self-reinforced disadvantage. For example, colleges often commit themselves to "target" figures for the admission of the disadvantaged, with built-in programs of remedial education to equalize the opportunities for academic success. The Teamster's "Transportation Opportunity Program" (TOPS) in Los Angeles estimates that the vast majority of its trainees has arrest records. With intensive support, that program began by placing 36 out of 40 ex-felons of its first graduating class with jobs, jobs paying an average of $165 a week. Corporations are experimenting with special programs which, in effect, give favored treatment to those with multiple handicaps in the competitive labor market. Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, for example, administers a special program for the hard core, in which a large percentage of the enrollees have criminal records. The "revolution" of traditional attitudes which must take place was graphically portrayed by one corporate executive, as he explored the challenge of the National Alliance of Businessmen in finding job opportunities for the hard-core unemployed. When he talked to personnel administrators, he said:

> It was the most shattering experience of my life. In the middle of my presentation, I suddenly realized that these guys had been trained for their whole life in business to screen people out—and here I was asking them to screen people in. Fifty percent of them were negative and 50 percent said nothing.

To put it bluntly, this campaign involves the abandonment of the "survival-of-the-fittest" standards in job recruitment where the "fitness" or job success potential of the candidate is reflected by his scores on placement tests and a "clean" record. (25)

EXTENDING PROBATIONARY PERIODS WITH SYMPATHETIC JOB ORIENTATION

Union and management can extend job orientation and probationary periods, so that the adjustment process for ex-offenders might have some chance of working itself out. Personnel officers should be provided with special training so that they might be sensitive to the differences in the value structure of individuals removed from regular employment. What is required is that all persons in the work community reveal some understanding and support for those confronted with the challenge and support for those confronted with the challenge of the work environment. Fears and insecurities of the disadvantaged are intensified by formal situations where the work environment appears impersonal and bureaucratic, and where they are expected to follow a routine which is unfamiliar and, perhaps in their minds, irrelevant. (26)

The avoidable penalties of hiring practices are suggested by the testimony of one top Department of Labor official about the experiences of a Chicago firm. This firm had consistently refused to hire anyone with a police record. But in a recent in-depth personnel audit of long-term employees, it was found that the vast majority of all hard-working and successful employees in fact had arrest records. Because employees had not disclosed those arrests at the time of their hire, it was possible for both company and worker to benefit from stable and productive service. There is, fortunately, a growing awareness in the business community of the hard-core problem. General Electric Corporation Board chairman Gerald L. Phillippe has described the

need for a "fresh, hard look" at existing hiring techniques. He observed:

> We can no longer predict reliable results from traditional and previously reliable testing and interviewing practices. Established training programs are not adequate or useful in bringing these (hard core) people to productive job levels.

There must be training programs for dropouts, new foreman-development programs, a new orientation of personnel officers to problems of absenteeism, pre-employment education, and so on. In outlining some tentative guidelines, Phillippe explained:

> . . . As a means of establishing some working priorities, it may be that we shall have to direct our efforts first to the attitudes of the disadvantaged people before we can actually undertake skills training; or at least stress attitudes as well as skills in our training programs.
> . . . in the light of growing experience in the business community, it seems highly likely that a broad new set of hiring techniques and practices is in the making, and these are going to become essential ingredients in any effective community program to provide more jobs for the disadvantaged. Instead of employment practices that screen *out* people, we need ways to screen them in. (27)

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF POLICE RECORDS

The Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations has proposed some guidelines for employers in the evaluation of arrest records to minimize the risk of automatically disqualifying potentially productive job applicants.

First, *employers should review the frequency and severity of violations of past offenders.* As noted at the outset, few citizens can claim that they have never broken a single law. The clean record for most citizens may well reflect where they lived when young—a place where police scrutiny of individual behavior is not a day-to-day occurrence. Or perhaps they were just lucky they were not caught.

Many of us were impulsive, aggressive, or reckless in our youth, with that adventuresome spirit which is contained with maturity. It is not reasonable that individuals should be penalized for life because of indiscretions of youth.

Secondly, *employers should consider the span of time since applicants were released from prison.* The weight of evidence shows that the return to a life of crime for a released prisoner is most likely to take place immediately following release. A substantial lapse of time since evidence of difficulty with the law can well be interpreted as self-improvement on the part of the applicant.

Thirdly, *employers should give thoughtful consideration to the whole man,* his aptitudes and abilities, rather than simply to one episode of his personal history. We are drawn, by nature, to the dramatic and sometimes to the sordid episodes in personal experience. Employers should balance the evidences that reveal positive qualities of the ex-offender, against the character of the infraction. It is the whole man who will be serving the employer.

Fourth, *employers should consider the geographic location of the incidents involved.* As emphasized at the outset, few emerge from ghetto life in the inner-city without an arrest record; similarly, in some southern states, minority people have a higher frequency of contact with the police than non-minorities.

EX-OFFENDERS HAVE DIFFICULTY GETTING BONDED

One measure of the conditioned reflex of skepticism and pessimism employers reveal when confronted with the invitation to hire ex-offenders, is shown by their lack of effort to obtain bonding for them. Frequently the bonding requirement for employees has been impeded by the reluctance of bonding companies to assume the risks of bonding ex-offenders. This provides employers with a ready-made rationale for not hiring ex-offenders.

A fidelity bond is a contract under which any loss sus-

tained by an employer, because of the dishonesty of covered employee, is made good by the bonding company. There has been an increasing tendency on the part of firms to secure such insurance as a method for protecting themselves from dishonest employees. But such expansion in the use of bonding has involved unanticipated discrimination against men who are otherwise qualified for employment but who have criminal records. For, in exchange for the protection provided by the bonding company, the employer cedes to the bonding company some discretion regarding those he hires. Guidelines are imposed to minimize risk to the bonding companies by scrutiny of the job candidate's history. Companies are often contractually obligated to avoid "knowingly" hiring persons with criminal records. To most companies, ex-offenders are automatically regarded as substandard risks. Employers often contend, therefore, that their legal contracts restrain their taking any risks by hiring ex-offenders. As emphasized throughout, the presumption that ex-offenders were "bad" employee risks has been reinforced by the general mythology that such must be the case, even though there is little sound evidence on the subject. The bonding requirement looms large, since it is often required in hotel jobs, even for maids and baby sitters, for those working in sales, or as credit clerks or collection agents. It is estimated that twenty-five percent of all commercial office jobs have bonding requirements. Even government programs to train the disadvantaged have been partially thwarted by bonding requirements. Many applicants for the MDTA Floor Maintenance Mechanic Training program had police records, but many floor-maintenance jobs required bonding.

> The group hardest hit by this are Negro trainees, many of whom, because of the areas of the cities in which they have lived, as well as other factors of disadvantage, have police records. The Employment Service felt, in view of this, that they should take only applicants for the training program who eventually could be placed, and began to screen out those who had prior felony convictions. (28)

In order to deal with the barriers to employment represented by the bonding requirement, the Department of Labor (under Section 105 of the MDTA Manpower Administration Order 2-66) authorized a demonstration program on February 21, 1966. Rather than run its own bonding program, a contract was let on the basis of competitive bids to the United Bonding Insurance Company. The Labor Department anticipated that it could bond approximately 1700 persons at an annual level of $2500 per person. New York, Washington, Chicago and Los Angeles were identified as demonstration cities. Early experience with the project indicated that few individuals had taken advantage of the bonding arrangement. It was soon found, however, that when employers were notified that bonding could be provided under the Labor Department program, they went back to their own commercial bonding companies, which, in many cases . . . provided bonding for the applicants after all. (29)

In the first two years of the program individuals were bonded by the Federal government, but only six claims were drawn. This is a far superior record to that experienced for any other segment of society. Because of this remarkable record, the original restrictions of the program, requiring that individuals had to be federally trained and referred by government employment office, have now been dropped. Individuals must have only permanent jobs at prevailing wages, and bond protection is available, to the $5000 level for all but the self-employed. The program's success has encouraged its expansion to nineteen major cities. (30)

In a study conducted by Alfred N. Himelson of fidelity bonding practices in the Los Angeles area conducted just prior to the introduction of this government program, (31) industry representatives affirmed that they did not have any means of assessing individual risk for the ex-offenders. Nor did industry have any plans in the future for the development of individual risk assessment experience. Thus, there seemed to be little prospect that prediction tables would be developed to assess hiring strategies for workers with crim-

inal records. Himelson undertook a study of a sample of 302 firms, including 37 in finance, real estate and insurance. Sixty-nine percent indicated they had a previous employment experience with former offenders. (32) The overwhelming number of respondents, seventy-nine percent, indicated that their performance was either "very good" or "good to average." The Himelson study acknowledges the difficulty of "unraveling" the attitudes and policies of employers from the discriminatory standards imposed by security-minded bonding companies, but the suspicion is raised in the study that "many employers are still using fidelity bonding requirements as an excuse not to hire people they would rather not have in their employ under any circumstances." (33)

IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN JOB SURVIVAL

It is our opinion that if an employer desired (at least in the State of California), he could avail himself of the services of the Adult Education Division of his local school district to devise and operate a program of on-the-job orientation in employment survival. State subsidies to Adult Education could conceivably foot most of the bill, and federal programs for employing the "hard-core" unemployed can supplement this. A traditional, structured class situation is definitely not envisioned here; the program should probably be a counseling, group-therapy, group-dynamics type; open-ended, flexible, innovative. The expert adult education consultant should be prominent in the planning, as should all levels of mangement, as well as the "hard-core" themselves. The program should include "seminars" for management as well, perhaps combined with employees, for management needs desperately to learn how to help its employees succeed.

Such a program should concentrate on what the employees need to know *now*, and only that; learning is a function of need only, and learners are likely to learn what they need at the time. Since employee motivation is para-

mount here, all consideration of deferred educational values or formal academic education is entirely out of the picture.

This implies a continuing research project into what the nature of the program should be, starting long before the courses themselves, and continuing as long as the instructional program itself. The research should inquire into the success characteristics of the "hard-core" employee, his failure characteristics, his felt needs, the felt needs of supervisors, and general management (in the realm of behavior as well as production), how the rest of the "normal" employees react to the "hard-core" and any program devised for them, and other such matters.

In the past several years, a growing number of organizations and educational institutions have been attempting to address themselves to the problems of the hard core. While most of these efforts are still in the pioneering stage, we are encouraged at least that some constructive steps are being undertaken in attempts to alleviate the complex problem.

SOME CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Even before all the evidence is in, it is obvious that there is much more to be gained by developing an atmosphere that makes criminal behavior unnecessary than by simply making additional investments in the rehabilitation process. The forces that encourage crime are often the same forces that frustrate the rehabilitation process. The strategies utilized to prevent a return to crime are the same principles that prevent crime.

Because unrest, revolts and violence have been so greatly advertised today, speculations abound on all sides about the possibility of a new "culture of crime" which may characterize a segment of our society. Popular themes emphasize the typical cynicism that rich and poor alike "have a racket," with differentials of affluence attributed to the relative efficiency of the hustling technique. The competitive nature of our economic and social behavior induces at least

some measure of dishonesty typically represented by the synthetic claims of advertising. The "beat" generation says, "Ajax *isn't* stronger than dirt". Others emphasize that this country was born in violence and its development has been punctuated with outbursts of violence, rationalized by self-serving simplistic plots between good guys and bad guys. Others point to the gambling or risk-taking impulse of Americans, with its traditional innocence about the prospect of getting "something for nothing." Still others point to the influence of violence on a new generation that has spent more hours watching television than hours spent in the classroom. Another popular theme is the so-called "collapse" of the relevance or meaning of our traditional achievement standards. For a generation that has so much provided before the contest begins, Horatio Alger stories are as "camp" as a W. C. Fields movie. With the once traditional "challenge" to secure economic status now of little relevance, young people's energies may be diverted to perverse distractions involving crime, say some. Still others emphasize what they see as a deterioration of moral standards for all ages afforded by the experience of affluence: drugs, pills, alcoholism, promiscuity, infidelity; in brief, a decay in the quality of life ultimately reflected in a contempt for traditional values.

But any catalogue of forces contributing to an asserted decline of respect for law and order must give prime attention to the urban crisis. We live in a metropolitan society revealing a new set of complex economic and social problems. Metropolitan life is characterized by its mobility, fluidity, by people's sense of detachment, anonymity, and impotence. Demographic and technological change combine to give visibility to the urban crisis, setting our society adrift from its moorings to traditional values. Casting this in the context of the problem of crime, the late Joseph D. Lohman has explained:

> It is not that there is a culture of crime. It is that there is a plurality of subcultures, that the problem of the individual's adjustment to commonly accepted norms is con-

> founded, and that deviance and opposition to law and authority are generated as a matter of course. Crime, delinquency, disrespect for law and order are generated as a matter of course. (34)

In this context, Lohman concludes, "It may well be that what we observe as disrespect for law is a normal reaction of normal people to an abnormal condition." (35)

The estrangement to society is nowhere more in evidence than in the culture of crime in the central city. A major part of our minority society is being denied a reasonable opportunity to behave the way society expects it to behave. And it must be added here, that many expectations of "society" may be unworthy and out of date. Denied the tap root for its dignity—a job—or the sap for its growth or development—an income—these residents have developed their own subculture, dominated by the reality of poverty and crime, and more recently, by a menacing nationalism and militancy. However one may lament their lack of frustration-tolerance or problem-solving ingenuity, the choice of that "other" society can hardly be a surprising response by individuals who, by any statistical measure, lack genuine prospects for success.

The cynical attitude about crime that typifies society is reflected in the surprising suspicion that roughly one-half of all crimes are never reported. And for the half reported, 77 percent are never solved. And from 30 percent to 70 percent of prisoners experiencing the "correctional" process are reimprisoned within five years of their release, usually for worse crimes.

Karl Menninger provides some penetrating insights into criminal minds. In his view, criminals may be seeking vengeance against real or symbolic tormentors. They are sure that society is wrong. Their cynicism about access to justice is confirmed by their trial experience, which to them is dominated by its contest between lawyers, and not characterized by an impartial effort to diagnose motivation, to secure understanding. And because so few criminals are caught, one feels that getting captured was their only mis-

take. Beyond this, prisoners are caged in prisons without job training, suffer sexual deprivation and more, to be eventually dumped back into society that hates "convicts." (36)

The incredible inefficiency of our present arrangements might be dismissed as simply another indulgence of a rich society that can afford to waste physical resources. But unhappily, it is the waste of human resources, not simply physical resources, that takes place with our present correctional and rehabilitation procedures.

We must create labor markets where the threat to self-respect for major segments of our society is not a daily hazard. And for those ever-increasing numbers who are convicted of crime, we must fashion much more flexible instruments for restoring self-respect. The traditional morality with its focus on punishment was built on the assumption that through isolation or solitude, men would indulge in introspective meditation, recognize the error of their ways and formulate programs for the reconstruction of their lives. What a travesty! Modern social and psychological experience give these fallacies the lie, but our institutions go blindly on.

The involvements of the community—and more specifically—*your* involvement in programs of rehabilitation, represent the only certain mechanism for reducing the dimensions of this problem. The calculus of economic analysis indicates that this is a prudent investment. But more important, the spirit of humanity indicates that this must be done.

REFERENCES

1. The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, December 10, 1969.
2. Marvin E. Wolfgang, "Violence, USA—Riots and Crime" in *Crime and Delinquency,* October, 1968, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 293-294.
3. Wesley Donald Pointer, "Education and Training Versus Maintenance and Other Prison Work Programs" Draper Conference on MDT in Correctional Programs, Montgomery, Alabama, May 24, 1967, p. 110 in Project Challenge.
4. *Taming the Criminal,* New York: Macmillan, pp. 295-296.
5. "Good Guys and Bad Guys," *Federal Probation,* Vol. 30, No. 3, Sept. 1966, p. 14.
6. *Federal Probation,* Vol. 30, No. 3, Sept. 1966, p. 12.
7. "Chief of U.S. Prisons Calls System Failure," Mike Feinsilber, *Los Angeles Times,* November 17, 1968.
8. President's Crime Commission Report, p. 159.
9. Crime Commission Report, p. 163.
10. "Lessons from the Adult Correctional System of Sweden," *Federal Probation,* Vol. 30, No. 4, December, 1966, p. 6.
11. Crime Commission Report, p. ix.
12. Ibid., p. ix.
13. Sanger Powers, "Contradictions in Corrections: A Critique", *American Journal of Corrections,* Vol. 23, No. 6, Nov.-Dec., 1961, pp. 6-7.
14. Robert Evans, Jr., "Released Offender in a Changing Labor Market," *Industrial Relations,* Vol. 5, No. 3, May, 1966, p. 120.
15. "Opening Doors for Ex-Offenders," paper presented by Dr. Aller at the NCCJ Conference April 16, 1968.
16. Final Report: *Task Force on New Careers and Job Development,* Delinquency and Crime Commission, Los Angeles County, May 28, 1968.
17. "Off Grounds Activities Present an Opportunity for Correctional Institutions," *Federal Probation,* June, 1967, p. 15.
18. "Vocational Rehabilitation and Corrections: A Promising Partnership," *Federal Probation,* September, 1967, p. 16.
19. "Preparing Prisoners for their Return to the Community," *Federal Probation,* Vol. 30, No. 2, June, 1966, p. 49.
20. Project Challenge, p. 98.
21. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Administration, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1967, p. 77.
22. The Seventh Step Foundation, pamphlet of Los Angeles Chapter No. 1, P.O. Box 8955, Los Angeles, California.
23. President's Crime Commission Report, p. 75.
24. President's Crime Commission Report, p. 75 (italics added).
25. "Target: Negro Jobs", *Newsweek,* July 1, 1968, p. 22.
26. Ibid., p. 29.
27. "Business and the Urban Crisis", Executive Speech Reprints, Schenectady, New York, p. 6.

28. Risk and Rehabilitation, p. 22.
29. Ibid., p. 78.
30. "Federal Program Gives Offenders a Chance," *Southern California Teamster*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2, December 12, 1967, p. 2.
31. "Risk and Rehabilitation: A Study of the Fidelity Bonding of Former Offenders," Report of a Study conducted under a grant from the United States Vocation Rehabilitation Administration, RD 2076G 66, Institute for the Study on Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, Calif. 1966.
32. "Federal Program Gives Offenders a Chance," *Southern California Teamster*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2, December 12, 1967, p. 2.
33. Ibid., p. 27.
34. "Current Decline in Respect for Law and Order," *The Federal Probation*, December 1967, p. 22.
35. Ibid., p. 22.
36. *The Crime of Punishment*, Viking, 1968, with review comments provided in *Time*, December 6, 1968, pp. 117-120.

SPEAKERS AT NCCJ SPONSORED INSTITUTES AND SEMINARS ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE EX-OFFENDERS

1966 - 1970

Dr. Curtis C. Aller, former Associate Manpower Administrator, Dept. of Labor

Dr. Leonard P. Aries, vice president of NCCJ and director of Equal Opportunity in Industry Programming

Mr. John Buggs, former executive director, Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations and presently with the National Urban Coalition

Mr. Clinton T. Duffy, former warden San Quentin Prison

Mr. J. W. Erhlich, noted San Francisco attorney

Dr. Gerhard E. Ehmann, dean of Educational Services, Calif. State College at Fullerton

Dr. La Mar T. Empey, director, Youth Studies Center at the University of Southern California

Mr. Alfred N. Himelson, project director, Risk and Rehabilitation Project

Mr. Karl R. Kunze, manager, Training and Management Personnel, Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

Mr. John H. Muchmore, manager, Industrial Relations, The Garrett Corporation

Mr. L. M. Stutsman, deputy director, Calif. State Dept. of Corrections

Dr. Paul Sultan, chairman, Graduate Faculty in Economics at Claremont Graduate School

Mr. Ralph Tandowsky, director of Employee Relations, McDonnell Douglas Corp.

Mr. Paul Tubman, assistant to the director of Industrial Relations, Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

Mr. Ted Watkins, chairman, Watts Labor Community Action Committee

Mr. Ralph Woolpert, director, Labor Relations, Thrifty Drug Stores

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS?

NCCJ is a civic organization engaged in a nationwide program of intergroup education. It enlists Protestants, Catholics and Jews who without compromise of conscience or of their distinctive and important religious differences work together to build better relationships among men of all religions, races and nationalities. Its operation is civic and social although, obviously, the roots of the brotherhood which it seeks to build are in the moral law and in religious faith.

MAR 15 71

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

43 West 57th Street New York, N. Y. 10019

GEORGE CHRISTOPHER
WILLIAM F. MAY
— Co-Chairmen —
ROBERT D. MURPHY
OSCAR S. STRAUS II

OSCAR M. LAZRUS
Secretary
LAWRENCE H. BOBER
Treasurer
LEWIS GRUBER
Chairman-Finance

STERLING W. BROWN
President
DAVID HYATT
Executive Vice President

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M. 87112
10500 Love N.E.

ATLANTA, GA. 30303
1022 First Federal Bldg.

BALTIMORE, MD. 21201
300 Equitable Bldg.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA. 35203
927-8 City Federal Bldg.

BOSTON, MASS. 02108
73 Tremont Street

BRONX-WESTCHESTER
175 Main St.
White Plains, N. Y. 10602

BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201
105 Court Street

BUFFALO, N. Y. 14202
Suite 35, Hotel Statler-Hilton

CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28204
P.O. Box 4436

CHATTANOOGA, TENN. 37402
317 Jackson Bldg.

CHICAGO, ILL. 60601
203 No. Wabash Ave.

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202
1331 Enquirer Bldg.

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114
304 Investment Ins. Bldg.

DALLAS, TEXAS 75201
1028 Dallas Athletic Club Bldg.

DENVER, COLO. 80202
821 - 17th Street, Rm. 305

DES MOINES, IOWA 50309
309 Sixth Avenue

DETROIT, MICH. 48202
150 W. Boston Blvd.

DULUTH, MINN. 55802
10 East Superior St.

EL PASO, TEXAS 79902
409 Executive Center Blvd.
Suite 202

FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102
1801 T.W.C. Electric Bldg.

GREENSBORO, N. C. 27401
515 Southeastern Bldg.

HARTFORD, CONN. 06103
983 Main Street

HOUSTON, TEX. 77002
405 Main Street

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. 46202
1815 N. Meridian St.

JAMAICA, N. Y. 11433
92-32 Union Hall St.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y. 14701
11 Dewey Place

KANSAS CITY, MO. 64106
916 Walnut St., Suite 701

LANCASTER, PA. 17602
508 N. Duke St.

LAS VEGAS, NEV. 89102
3135 Industrial Rd.
Suite 126

LITTLE ROCK, ARK. 72201
950 Tower Building

LOCKPORT, N. Y. 14094
147 North Adams

LONG BEACH, CALIF. 90813
1540 East 7th St.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90005
3335 Wilshire Blvd.

LOUISVILLE, KY. 40202
427 W. Walnut St.

MANCHESTER, N. H. 03101
45 Market Street

MEMPHIS, TENN. 38103
930 Falls Bldg.

MIAMI, FLA. 33131
906 Dupont Plaza Center

MILWAUKEE, WISC. 53202
759 N. Milwaukee St.

MINEOLA, L. I., N. Y. 11501
212 Front St.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN. 55402
520 National Bldg.

NEWARK, N. J. 07102
790 Broad Street, Rm. 1102

NEW ORLEANS, LA. 70130
611 Gravier St.

NEW YORK, N. Y. 10019
43 West 57th St.

NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y.
330 Niagara Street
Lewiston, N. Y. 14092

NORFOLK, VA. 23510
269 Boush St.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA. 73102
120 Robert S. Kerr Ave.
Rm. 820

OMAHA, NEB. 68101
4016 Farnam St., Rm. 105

PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19107
101 S. 13th St., Suite 300

PHOENIX, ARIZ. 85003
624 Luhrs Bldg.

PITTSBURGH, PA. 15222
100 Fifth Ave., Rm. 512

PORTLAND, OREG. 97205
605 Platt Bldg.
519 S.W. Park Ave.

PROVIDENCE, R. I. 02906
221 Waterman St.

RENO, NEV. 89505
Washoe Co.
P.O. Box 1486

RICHMOND, VA. 23230
2317 Westwood Ave.

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78205
118 Broadway, Suite 232

SAN DIEGO, CALIF. 92101
Suite 535 U.S. Grant Hotel

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF. 94103
703 Market Street

SAN JOSE, CALIF. 95125
1153 Lincoln Ave.

SEATTLE, WASH. 98101
504 Seaboard Bldg.

SHREVEPORT, LA. 71104
1031 Dudley Dr.

SOUTH BEND, IND. 46601
404 Commerce Bldg.

ST. LOUIS, MO. 63101
721 Olive St.

TULSA, OKLA. 74103
Center Bldg., Rm. 309
630 W. 7th St.

UPPER NEW YORK STATE
43 West 57th St.
New York, N. Y. 10019

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005
1425 H St., N.W.

WICHITA, KANS. 67202
[illegible] Brown Bldg.

WICHITA FALLS, TEXAS 76308
P.O. Box 4066

WILMINGTON, DEL. 19801
[illegible] DuPont Street

CANADIAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS
506-508 Ryrie Bldg., 229 Yonge St., Toronto, Canada

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAR 15 1971
on Adult Education